

## COMMUNICATIONS.

## WHAT OUR JOURNAL IS DOING. SOME TRUTH.

No man more fully realized the enormity of the task undertaken when the State Society decided to publish an ethical journal and endorsed the policy of truth telling established by the Publication Committee, than did the editor of this JOURNAL. He knew and he knows the rottenness pervading the business of exploiting the medical profession by many pharmaceutical manufacturers and manufacturers of nostrums. But it seemed as though a little truth, told unflinchingly, might do some good. For at least five years quiet, personal, effort had been made by others to induce the *Journal A. M. A.* to become decent, but without result; no one would speak out, and little could be done when all other medical journals in the land could point to the official organ of the physicians themselves as excuse for advertising absolutely rotten, vile and worthless stuff, nostrums, etc., ad nauseam. The editor expected to get plenty of abuse, and he has not been disappointed; some of it has approached pretty close to personal slander. Fortunately for him, every step taken, every matter of policy, every decision connected with the advertising question, has been gone over by the whole Publication Committee. That committee has had many meetings and nearly all of them have been attended by every member. So far as the financial side is concerned, every transaction has been carefully inspected by the auditing committee of the Trustees and they know just what is going on and just what is being done. It would therefore be an easy matter to protect the editor from slander at home; from the attacks of those abroad he does not care for protection, for he regards most of them as highly complimentary. All this is appropos of some letters recently received from some friends in various parts of the country. Two of these letters are of particular interest.

The first one stated that the men connected with the advertising department of the *Journal A. M. A.* were highly wroth with us for stirring up the advertising question, and that the manager of that department had been "knocking" our JOURNAL as hard as he could, impugning our motives and alleging personal reasons for our attitude. This, we must confess, we find it hard to believe; but it came pretty straight.

The second is of more general interest and therefore the editor bespeaks your careful reading of it. Some of it is decidedly too personal to quote, but most of it follows:

*Dear Dr. Jones:* In reply to your letter I would say that to repeat all the comments and criticisms would be too long a story; I will tell you more of them when I see you again. Some say the editorials are not dignified enough; that you should not discuss the advertising question; that you are being imposed upon (!); that your JOURNAL is operating for the benefit of a few good houses and the German chemical manufacturers. Other comments are too personal and abusive to be written. There are a number of concerns that would give almost anything to see your JOURNAL go to the wall. I learned of one house that was wildly indignant because, they said, the *Journal A. M. A.* had required them to give a formula on account of what you had published. It is certainly remarkable the commotion your little JOURNAL is making. You have arrayed against you the manufacturers of secret proprietary stuff, editors of personally or privately owned journals, advertising agencies and even some of the reputable houses. Nevertheless, it seems to me that they will have to come your way in time, especially if other state journals will adopt a similar policy. Of these, only three seem to be clean; Colorado, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. How medical societies will permit such atrocious advertisements as are appearing in the

*Missouri and the New York Association Journals*, I cannot understand; they are worse than the *Journal A. M. A.* ever was. I am very glad to say that you have a few very warm and enthusiastic friends in the business world, who decidedly approve the policy and course of your JOURNAL and appreciate the work your Society is doing. I learned through a common acquaintance that the O'Gorman Advertising Agency is clipping the articles in which you attack or mention unfavorably different houses, and sending the clippings to these concerns, trying to influence them against your JOURNAL. I learned, the other day, from one of your advertisers who is most enthusiastic in approval of the JOURNAL that a certain house in this city had offered to pay for his advertising in three other journals—any three he wanted—if he would withdraw his advertisement from yours. He assured me that he would not. If you can keep up the fight for another year and force the Trustees of the *A. M. A.* to adopt a policy of ethical decency in the conduct of the *Association Journal*, your fight, I think, will be won. Personally I wish you every possible success. Cordially yours, A. B.

## "OAKLAND AND VACCINATION."

*To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL:*—Referring to your editorial, "Oakland and Vaccination," Vol. II, No. 11, p. 326, I beg to say that instead of Oakland, some one in San Francisco is slightly behind the times. Oakland has been enforcing the Compulsory Vaccination Law since June, 1904. A free vaccination day has been in vogue here still longer. No case of smallpox has occurred in Oakland since July 12th, 1904. As to the anti-vaccination societies, they have not been heard from for some time, and we believe they die from inanition if not irritated. The enclosed 'Bulletin' of the Health Department may be of value. You may receive it regularly if you desire, and possibly thereby avoid unfortunate errors regarding Oakland. Our health is excellent, and we want everybody to know it, so please insert, and oblige.

Cordially yours,

EDWARD VON ADELUNG.  
Health Officer, Oakland, California.

(About the same time—almost in the same mail with the above letter—came a circular from a "Mrs. E. C. Campbell, Secretary," enclosing two leaflets entitled, respectively, "The Liberator," and "Legalized Child Murder." These documents are put out by an anti-vaccination society in Berkeley (home of learning and enlightenment) and the latter gives a list of doctors who indorse the anti-vaccination movement. The list is as follows: Dr. W. Allen, President of Board of Education, Berkeley; Dr. Farrar, Virginia street, Berkeley; Dr. Hitt, Adeline street, South Berkeley; Dr. J. N. Obery, Ellis street near Harmon, South Berkeley; Dr. W. H. Loomis, near Twenty-third on Twenty-ninth streets; East Oakland; Dr. Fahrman, Golden Gate; W. N. Griswold, M. D., 106 Eddy street, San Francisco; C. J. Holmgren, M. D., 1050 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco; Dr. A. D. Fouchy, 834 Santa Clara Avenue, Alameda; W. E. Ledyard, M. D., box 113, Alameda; R. Cauch, M. D., Carpenteria, Cal.; Blanche L. Sanborn, M. D., 1786 Sutter street, San Francisco; Dr. Nanie Clark, 722 West Seventh street, Los Angeles; Arthur C. Green, M. D., Broadway, Los Angeles; Matthew T. Wilson, M. D., 1666 Fell street, San Francisco; Edmund Beckwith, M. D., Petaluma; W. E. Ahernbaugh, M. D., Napa; Mrs. Dr. Moore, Berkeley; J. T. Tapley, Marysville, Yuba county; J. E. Huffman, M. D., 546 Sutter street, San Francisco; H. M. Bishop, M. D., 2627 Hoover street, Los Angeles; George Pyburn, M. D., 1011 H street, Sacramento; W. P. Chamberlain, M. D., Santa Cruz; Albert Hiller, M. D., 1019 Sutter street, San Francisco; W. P. Burke, M. D., Alauric, Sonoma county; and Dr. Franklin of Oakland, who brings the news

that Oregon has repealed the Compulsory Vaccination Law.

Of these, eight seem to have no license, or at least no record can be found of that fact; 16 are homeopaths, and 2 are eclectics. It certainly is a great surprise to see the names of so many homeopaths in the list, for one would imagine that vaccination was right in line with "similia similibus." The "antis" are making all the capital they can out of the death of one child from tetanus, some time ago, probably due to uncleanness. The parents of this child had probably not read the advice of the San Francisco Board of Health, and *acquired the habit of cleanliness, or cleanness.*—ED.)

#### THE DRUGGIST QUESTION—ANOTHER VIEW.

To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL:—In the November number of the JOURNAL, a communication from Dr. Musgrove on "The Druggist Question," only partially reaches the truth, from my standpoint. While in some sections druggists may be under the influence of the nostrum manufacturers and endeavor to devote most of their attention to that portion of the drug business, is his brother druggist, in some other section, trying to do a legitimate prescription business, but under the control of the nostrum-prescribing physician, any better off? I have seen many a physician's fee go astray by his prescribing articles like "Gude's pepto-mangan," "listerine," "Fellow's syrup," etc., to prescription-reading patients who afterward bought these articles in the original package and advise families or friends to use them as "Dr. So and So" had prescribed them under similar conditions. I have many a recipe on file that, calling for "A's this" and "B's that," mixed, looks like a ready-made suit badly altered to fit the customer, and probably fits the patient's case about as well as such a suit would fit his body. Let the physician first rid himself of the nostrum-prescribing habit, and the druggist who wants to do a legitimate business will only too gladly follow his lead and return to the simple drugs and pharmacopeal preparations.

DAVID H. FLETCHER.

(The JOURNAL has over and over again called attention to the harm which doctors do to their patients and to themselves when they prescribe this "ready-to-take" medicine. Why they continue to do it, the good kind Lord alone knows! It has been alleged that they do it because they do not know enough to write a prescription, and possibly there is a good bit of truth in that. At any rate, they do it and they themselves have had more to do with debauching the profession of pharmacy than any other factor. The physician has been too credulous; has had too little thought for the commercial interests back of manufacturing; has regarded all manufacturers too much in the light of philanthropists; has had too little thought for his own good. Probably, too, he has had far too little instruction in legitimate materia medica.)

#### Patent Medicine Advertising.

We observe that the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, is beginning to print the formulæ of proprietary remedies along with the advertisement. While this might strike some as a case of an eleventh hour repentance, it is to us a gratifying sign of progress in the right direction.

We do not hesitate to assume that hereafter no contract can be made with *The Journal of the American Medical Association* to advertise a proprietary remedy in which it shall not be stipulated that the formulæ shall be a portion of the advertisement.

As a corollary to this position, it will follow that no reputable medical journal will in future venture to make a contract to advertise a proprietary remedy unless the formula shall be a part of the advertisement.—*Journal of the Medical Society of New Jersey.*

#### PRECOCIOUS MENSTRUATION.

I was recently called to see a child who had swallowed a baby pin and was at once struck with the unusual development of the child. It was two years and four months of age, but had the body and limbs of a much older child.

The child was born May 13, 1902, and the mother noticed soon after its birth that the external genitals were enlarged. She asked her attendant about it and was told that it was a little swelling, which would soon disappear. The child was fretful and cried practically all the time when awake, till it was six months old. Its sleep had never been good, and it was always restless. When six months old the mother noticed that the child was bleeding as if menstruating. The flow became very free and the child sank into its first peaceful sleep. The flow continued for 3 or 4 days, just as mother, but she did not consult her physician. After 28 days the flow again made its appearance and continued for the same time and in the same quantity. Since then the child has menstruated every 23 days regularly for the same number of days and showing the same quantity, soiling 2 napkins a day, except that on two occasions there was a little delay, corrected by warm drinks and foot baths. The child is of normal height and face for one of her age. The breasts are well developed and of good size, as are the nipples. The trunk and legs show the development of a much older child. The hips are broad and rounded, and the calves well developed. The mons veneris is large and covered with a good growth of long, silky hair, which is light in color but beginning to change to a darker shade. The labia are large and very prominent.

So far as the literature in private and public libraries shows, there is but one recorded case of menstruation before the age of one year, and that showed the establishment of the menses just prior to that age. This case is unique in that the menses were established at apparently the earliest age on record.—*Ford in Journal of the American Medical Association.*

#### WATCH YOUR LEGISLATORS!

The following list, arranged, for convenience, by counties, has been compiled from the newspaper reports of the result of the last election. The letter (s) following a name indicates a State Senator, and the letter (a) an Assemblyman. Names printed in black face type are those of gentlemen who have replied to the letters sent them by your secretary and the secretary of the Homeopathic State Society, and they have indicated their intention to leave the medical law alone.

It is now up to each county to watch its legislators and see that, in the coming session, these gentlemen do no tampering with two extremely valuable laws. First, the medical law; second, the law requiring vaccination of school children.

Members should study this list carefully, pick out the names of men they know, and write to them at once expressing their views in regard to the two laws mentioned. Remember that we are not merely a few weak individuals, but that the two societies now represent over 2,000 physicians of California.

It is part of every doctor's life work to shield and guard the public welfare in all things pertaining to health. Here is some work for you to do right along that line. Do not neglect it. Both of these laws are vitally important for the public good; they must not be tampered with.

Alameda—Mattos (s), Simpson (s), G. R. Lukens (s), Strawbridge (a), J. C. Bates, (a), Walsh (a), J. J. Burke (a), Bliss (a), Espey (a), W. H. Waste (a).

Alpine—McKenney (a).

Amador—McKenney (a).

Butte—Gates (a).

Calaveras—McKenney (a).